

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC CHARITY AND PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY IN GERMANY.[1] II.

III.

THE reform was begun in the fall of 1892 by the employment of an expert.[2] This, however, had absolutely no connection with the breaking out of the cholera the same fall, frequent public statements to the contrary notwithstanding. The reform and the calling of an expert had been decided upon long before the cholera broke out, although the two events were contemporaneous. And yet the cholera did have a considerable influence upon the development of poor-relief in the succeeding years of the reform. In the first place, the epidemic showed that public relief was by no means able to meet the demands of such an emergency, thus deepening the conviction of the necessity of a reform and giving the work the benefit of favorable public sentiment. In the second place, however, the distress created a need for speedy and more extended relief work than even a well-organized public relief could have furnished. As a result subcommittees were promptly organized in each of the smaller districts of the city, for such work as providing boiled water, provisions, clothing, and gifts of money, finding temporary homes for children, and supervising the distribution of the abundant stores which flowed in from all directions, even from foreign lands. The whole of this work was under the superintendence of a central committee composed, besides a few leading spirits, of the chairman of the subcommittees. In spite of the mistakes made by these committees, principally at the start, they performed most extraordinary services in supplying rapid and suitable relief. A very large number of men and women

[1] Concluding article. Translated for the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY by O. E. WIELAND.

[2] The writer of this paper.

devoted themselves to the work in the most unselfish manner, and during this brief period learned more about poor-relief and philanthropy than long years of experience in connection with public relief or private philanthropic societies could teach. For the reform, the importance of this work lay in the fact that it convinced all classes of the necessity of relief work, and brought out and even distinguished a large number of persons hitherto entirely unknown in this work, to whom the directors of relief work could successfully appeal, when, a little later, the reformed system was in need of a force of auxiliaries. This circumstance, therefore, was very favorable to the success of the reform. True, the cholera did, on the other hand, create conditions which were far from normal, and which, at the outset, severely obstructed the work. The great increase in the number of dependents was brought about not by actual needs alone, and the loss to many of their supporters, but also by the fact that many, while all kinds of assistance were so freely given, learned to like such subsidies, and supposed they were now to continue indefinitely. The first step in the introduction of the reform was the working out of a plan which should at the same time take advantage of the most recent scientific and practical experience, and be adapted to local conditions. The first of these requirements made the resulting system a modification, agreeing with the Elberfeld system principally in the entire independence of the helpers, while in compliance with the second the independence of the districts was extended in many ways; for instance, they were given the right of nomination for the offices of superintendent of a district and of new helpers and visitors; the appointment to both these offices being usually the prerogative of the general management. The choice of a temporary superintendent or chairman was left entirely to the districts; moreover, they were given a considerable power to vote aid.

The quarter system, on the other hand, which is characteristic of the Elberfeld system, was dropped on principle; it was also found necessary to drop their system of granting aid for a very brief period only. The principal advantage of the

quarter system lies in the fact that each dependent is from the start in definite relations to a particular helper, in whose "quarter" he lives, the quarter being very closely defined within certain streets and house numbers; the helper is therefore able to keep very fully informed on the conditions in his quarter; he can, within the range of the few houses allotted to him, find out every case that may demand his attention, and come in contact with the poor of his quarter frequently and in many different ways. The disadvantages are these: a given case must of necessity remain always under the same helper; under circumstances a sort of protectorate is developed; and (especially) an approximately even distribution of the population among these quarters has ceased. Frequently certain houses are occupied almost solely by the poorer class, while others do not contain a single dependent. It is therefore possible under this system, and it actually did occur in Hamburg, that some helpers had in charge houses containing fifty to sixty paupers, while others never saw anyone in need. Hamburg, therefore, as well as Berlin, Leipsic, and Dresden, has adopted the district system (*Bezirkssystem*). Here the district includes quite a number of streets and places. The district assembly or council is made up of the district superintendent or chairman (*Bezirksvorsteher*) and a number of helpers, varying with the needs of the district —usually not under twelve, under no circumstances more than twenty. But none of these helpers has, at the outset, any relation to a particular house or its occupants. On the contrary, every applicant for aid must first present himself to the district chairman (*Vorsteher*), who refers him, by means of an application blank, to one of his helpers; this helper, then, is obliged to examine into the case, supply any urgent and immediate need, and report at the next district assembly. Usually the case will be left in his charge for further treatment as long as the dependent continues to reside in his district; the case may, however, be given to another helper for further treatment. The advantage of this dividing of dependents among the several helpers by the superintendent lies in the fact that the latter can employ

all his helpers, not only in the same degree, but also each one according to his ability, without giving to all an equal number of cases. He will be able to give one living very near at hand more cases than he gives to one living at some distance, more to a man of considerable leisure than to a very busy man; to entrust to some very energetic person the investigation of a case demanding a great deal of energy, and to refer cases of aged people or children, where a tender heart is not so likely to be taken undue advantage of, to some tender-hearted person. Thus a superintendent is able to meet every need of a case, and at the same time to prevent the overburdening of certain helpers; he can also change helpers in a case, placing a dependent, either successively or simultaneously, under the charge of several helpers, etc. This system, which is very elastic, has proved extraordinarily successful in Hamburg.

The second point of difference, the lengthening of the period of time for which aid is granted, was, as has been said, a matter of necessity. In the nature of the case it is very desirable that aid be voted only for a very brief period, two or four weeks (in Elberfeld the time is a fortnight). But had this policy been adhered to in Hamburg, it would have necessitated such frequent sessions of the districts as to preclude from the very beginning the willingness of the helpers to assume the responsibilities of their office, or at any rate to give rise to a mere formalism soon after the introduction of the reform. Instead, however, the dependents are divided into several classes. Those whose genuine distress there is no reason to doubt, the aged, sick, and frail—in general, all sexagenarians—may be granted an allowance for six months; younger persons, as widows with several children, not longer than three months; all others, as able-bodied men and persons not sufficiently well known, are granted aid only from one session to the next, generally one month, in order that such cases may be under constant surveillance. For like reasons it was thought best to hold regular meetings of the districts only once a month in Hamburg, since fortnightly meetings would have been too

poorly attended, while on the present plan the attendance has hitherto been very good. These meetings are of very great importance; in them all cases are thoroughly discussed by all the helpers, and after due deliberation the proper measure of relief is decided upon by a vote of the entire body. In this way the assembly is bound more closely together, its members are kept informed as to conditions throughout the entire district, and they gradually arrive at uniform principles. It has been noticed, also, that friendly relations between the superintendent and the helpers are encouraged by this system.

A further point of difference between this and the Elberfeld system is the insertion of an intermediary between the district and the general administrative board; this is the circuit (*Kreis*), including a number of districts. In its geographical boundaries it follows roughly those of the ward (*Stadtbezirk*). The members of the circuit are the superintendents or chairmen of the districts, while the chairman of the circuit in turn is a member of the central board. The circuits discuss matters of common interest to all the districts, and hear complaints against the decision of the districts; they also consider and rule upon motions to grant hospital or institutional care (*Anstaltspflege*) for an extended period of time, or allowances exceeding a certain specified limit.

The central board, having for its chairman and vice chairman two members of the senate, is composed, as to the rest of its membership, of sixteen persons, chosen directly by the representative body of the city government (*Bürgervertretung*) on nomination by the board. It exercises a general supervision over the circuits and the districts, it is the court of last appeal for complaints, fixes general rules and principles, investigates the condition of the people at large, and decides upon more general remedial measures and agencies. The business management, finally, serves as the organ of the central board, preparing and carrying into effect the resolutions of the latter; it collects and keeps in a general registry information concerning all dependents. All applications for aid must pass through this central

office. If, in urgent cases, this was not possible before the voting of the aid, the whole matter is afterwards brought to the notice of the business management through the minutes of the district and circuit assemblies and such other papers from which it is copied, and filed with the rest of the papers referring to the particular pauper in question. This plan makes it very easy to detect duplication of relief. Moreover, whenever it appears from the papers that any circumstance of importance has escaped the notice of the helper who has the case in charge, he is notified of their full contents. When the decision and resolutions of one body are at variance with the laws or the business regulations, they are submitted to the next higher authority, the circuit or the central board. One of the most important principles of work is the demand for absolute reliability and the promptness and dispatch of the business world. The work of the business management includes a great many separate branches, such as the treasury department, the collecting of subscriptions from well-to-do relatives of dependents, the making good of claims a dependent may have upon other poor funds. All this is carefully regulated in detail by instructions and rules.

The entire corps active in poor-relief includes about twenty members of the central board, somewhat more than 100 district chairmen, nearly 1600 helpers and nearly 100 clerks. The distinction between the function of the honor offices and those held by professional or salaried officials may briefly be stated thus: the former foster the spirit of the work; the latter have the care of the forms; each is supplemented and modified by the other, so that neither arbitrariness, disorder, and looseness, on the one hand, nor, on the other, stiff formality and excessive writing may hamper the work. This aim has thus far been realized in a very satisfactory manner.

IV.

It was said above that the general principles of poor-relief are so fixed as to be applicable everywhere, if properly adapted to local environments. This will be borne out by a comparison of

German and American conditions. When the American reader has informed himself concerning the Elberfeld system, its working and application, and compares with it the methods and institutions in vogue in the larger cities of America, he will immediately and entirely concur in the statement that only a system of careful investigation of the individual case is in accord with correct principles of poor-relief. Moreover, he will fully understand why, in Germany, the development of this principle has led to outdoor relief as the principal form of public relief, while in America indoor relief, the almshouse, is predominant. This contrast results from that between a system of honor offices and one of salaried offices. If, in Germany, each commune has hundreds, if necessary even thousands, of citizens who are willing to assume the task of helping the poor, it is evident that they can rightly perform this duty only by entering into some sort of neighborly relations to the poor. And if, in America, it is not possible to disburse public funds and public means otherwise than through salaried public officials, it is no more than right to demand such control and supervision as is possible in the almshouse. Add to this the fact that the frequent changes of administration, both state and municipal, place public offices within the grant of each new ruler, that appointment to office has become, in no small degree, a reward for services rendered elsewhere, and the need of some means of control is very much augmented. Especially does this hold true for poor-relief, where there is danger lest the aid granted be made a reward for political services rendered by the recipient.

It is not mere chance that Warner, whose book is a summary of rich experience and a fine theoretical understanding and insight, arrives at the very same conclusion and expressly says: "It is through the development of a system of honor offices that outdoor relief in Germany has been robbed of its dangers, and it will be in part by the extension of the honor-office system in this country that the spirit of willingness to serve the state may be developed."

So long as one holds to the principle of individualization he

will concede that outdoor relief, with well-qualified helpers and visitors, gives the greater assurance of careful investigation and continued surveillance of the environment of dependents, and of their rapid return to normal economic conditions. The advantages are these: It is possible to find out exactly what the condition of the dependent has been previously, to get a knowledge of his character and of the life he is leading; to look into his home surroundings and to ascertain the state of health, education, etc., of himself and of his family. Furthermore, it is much easier to decide whether aid shall be given in the form of money or of provisions, by the securing of work, or by intervening with some private charity. True, the frail and the sick must still be cared for by indoor relief, but not in the workhouse. This principle of individualization makes it possible, also, to separate the family and legally to prosecute the indigent or drinking husband, while at the same time the innocent family is supported. Under circumstances recourse may then be had to the almshouse. I am of opinion, however, that this should be done only in exceptional cases; but then this method should be applied with the utmost rigor and severity, every other form of aid being denied. But in order that this be successful, it is absolutely necessary that the almshouse be, in reality, a workhouse, *i. e.*, maintained solely for persons who will not work, but who can work, and will finally be forced to choose this way of escaping the pangs of hunger. Should they seek to satisfy their wants by culpable means, as begging, stealing, or teaching their children to do these things, they are to be placed in a workhouse by force, or turned over to the civil authorities. The baneful custom of making the almshouse "the charitable catch-all for the community" must be abolished entirely. Especially is it necessary that children, the sick, and the frail be cared for in separate institutions. When aged people are kept in the same institution with indolent persons, there is great danger lest the indulgence and forbearance necessary toward the former slacken the discipline and thus alter the entire character of the place. The reverse may also come true; the strictness and severity neces-

sary in the reformatory treatment of the lazy and indigent may make the discipline that of a house of correction, and work injustice and injury to the aged and feeble.

All the more important and well-conducted poor-relief organizations in Germany base their efforts on these principles. The visitor is required to inform himself by personal visits, inquiry among neighbors, at bureaus of information, etc.,—if necessary even calling in the advice and assistance of the public physician for the poor (*Armenarzt*),—concerning the health of the dependent and of his family, the sanitary condition of their dwelling, etc.; he is also to find out whether or not the dependent be possessed of any property or means, whether he have any claim on relief funds of any sort, or upon relatives; besides all this the visitor is to ascertain the exact amount of the earnings both of the dependent himself and of his relatives, then determining the manner and amount of aid to be granted, after due consideration of all these facts. In the collecting of the information the business management assists if necessary. All these matters are then to be constantly kept watch over, the visitor recording all information in the books he is required to keep concerning each family under his charge. Due attention and consideration must, of course, be given to important changes, as the remarrying of a widow, death of children in a dependent family, inheritance of property, etc. The books mentioned above are to be kept in such a manner as to enable one at any time to get a full and clear idea of the circumstances in the case. Whenever the aid in a particular case is temporarily discontinued, the book is returned to the business management, where it is kept, to be reopened should the same family renew their application for support. When a dependent moves from one district to another, the book passes into the hands of the visitor in the district into which he moves.

The visitor first refers the applicant to those who may be indebted to him or otherwise under obligation, relatives, employers, insurance or benefit funds (*Versicherungskassen*), etc.; in this direction the visitors oftentimes accomplish a great deal

in recalling faithless persons, especially relatives, to their duty and their rightful obligations. Often the visitor has connections with some private charity to which he can appeal in the interest of especially worthy people. Frequently he will even supply an immediate want from his own purse, seeing that the case is only a temporary exigency and that the applicant has never before been dependent upon public relief. In many cases, too, the visitor is able, through his own personal influence, to find employment for his charge, thus making it possible to relieve the latter's distress by a temporary allowance only. The training of the citizen in the duties of a visitor and helper is productive of excellent results, arousing in him a most manifold interest for his ward, and teaching him to search out all possible ways in which the needed relief may be supplied most promptly and most thoroughly. It is unnecessary to state that this principle, which is, of course, emphatically expressed in the regulations, is not obeyed by all, that many slight their duties as visitor and helper and regard the whole work in an altogether too perfunctory manner; on the whole, however, this work is not only very successful, but of very great variety both in manner and direction of their efforts.

Whenever the conditions in any case are found to be such as to warrant relief at public expense, the total receipts of the family are to be ascertained and the allowance fixed accordingly. The length of time for which and the amount in which assistance is to be given must depend upon the nature of the distress and its probable duration. This aid consists principally in money, provisions being used only in a supplementary manner, chiefly clothing for children of school age (*schulpflichtige Kinder*), together with such articles as bedding, underwear, and the like In general, however, the principle is held, that the dependent himself will know better than any other person which of his needs should be satisfied first of all; it is furthermore believed that the expending of money is the best possible means by which to acquire frugal, economic habits. The visitor oversees the expenditure of the money in a general way, to see that it is rightly

and carefully spent. Should the dependent prove injudicious and careless in his use of the money, the allowance is of course withdrawn, or its revocation at least threatened. Least anxiety and suspicion is necessary in the case of widows, aged people, and children, whose physical condition, or whose inability to earn a living (*Erwerbsverhältnisse*) leave no question as to the necessity of help. Care must nevertheless be taken, in these cases, to search out relatives, and especially adult children who may be able to provide for their aged parents. Such search, conducted in the main by the business management (*Geschäftsverwaltung*), besides making a large number of allowances superfluous, has the general social effect of reminding the people that the first duty of a child is to care for its parents, a duty of which the people of Hamburg, for instance, previous to the reorganization, had become most shamefully oblivious. The rules pertaining to able-bodied persons are very strict; likewise those pertaining to women and children whose husbands and fathers are living, but are reported as having deserted their families. Even in these cases help cannot be denied when actual distress has been proven; but the allowance is always for a very brief period only, and its necessity thoroughly investigated upon each renewal of the application. Under no circumstances must the faithless father be permitted to feel that now he has deserted the family they are better off than if he himself still cared for them. And yet just such cases are the bane of nearly all relief organizations; for, while women and children, who are sometimes guiltless in the matter, cannot be left in the depth of misery and distress, it often turns out that husband and wife play into one another's hand, the wife pretending to be forsaken, only to draw an allowance.

The amount of the allowance depends upon the circumstances of the family: the number of children, the age of the father, etc. The fixing of the amount in a particular case is left to the judgment of the district, except where a definite amount per head is fixed by the regulations. Very serious objections might, however, be urged against this latter plan, which is in use in Elberfeld,

Cologne, Frankfort, and other cities: when, *e. g.*, the limit set for the head of a family is 3 M., for the wife 2.50 M., and for each child from 1 to 2 M., according to age, a large family will sometimes draw an allowance greater in amount than an ordinary laborer could earn. Besides, it is very difficult, with a fixed scale, to take cognizance of a change in economic conditions, or a change in the scale of wages; when, on the other hand, the fixing of the amount is left to the wisdom of the visitor of the district, the whole situation, all the facts, can be duly weighed and considered, the various other sources of income, opportunities for temporary employment, etc. True, this system is also not entirely free from objections: it leaves room for arbitrariness in fixing the amount of an allowance; and where it is in vogue it is found that in districts where a large number of wealthy persons act as visitors the allowances are too high, in the inverse case too low. In this respect we feel very keenly the lack of any trustworthy statistical reports concerning the domestic economy of the class next above the pauper class, *i. e.*, of the lowest self-supporting class, whose income must of necessity be a little higher than that of those who receive public aid.

Besides giving aid in the form of money and provisions, the public relief furnishes free medical attendance in all cases; for the calling of a physician, midwife, or nurse, easier forms have been introduced, so that no one, even in the most urgent case, need suffer for want of prompt and immediate help in the hour of need. But the importance of this department of the public relief has fallen off considerably of late years on account of the development of insurance, the majority of workmen now having access to some sick insurance fund. The most valuable means of promoting health, viz., healthful dwellings and good ventilation, often, alas! cannot be had, because of the wretched housing common in all large cities. It is an undeniable fact, however, that the various attempts at improvement in this matter have been due, in no small degree, to the participation of so large a number of citizens in the administration of public relief. For the visitors again and again discover what

hotbeds of disease and immorality poor dwellings are; and even the most selfish taxpayer cannot fail to see the force of the argument that the mere possession of a better dwelling will save a large number of persons from ever falling in need of public aid or public relief, and thus reduce very materially the expenses of public charities.

As in America, so also in Germany, relief organizations have given special attention to caring for children. Whenever it becomes necessary to interfere, or to take charge of a child, they aim to secure to it good, healthy surroundings, good bringing up, and thorough instruction; such children enjoy the protection and care of the respective charities even after entering the business world, while they are already earning their own livelihood. But here again we meet with the very same mischief already mentioned above in connection with the support of forsaken women. In an extraordinarily large number of cases the care of children by the public relief is welcomed by faithless parents as a very convenient way in which to receive aid themselves. This is especially true in the cases of the illegitimate offspring of workwomen and servant girls, who are hindered by their child, in returning to work. One favorite trick is to place a child in another and strange family on promise of payment for its keeping; the promise is not kept, and the strange foster parents are forced to appeal to charity. It is, of course, impossible completely to abolish the nuisance; it may be checked to some degree by dealing severely with the parents and, under circumstances, by legally prosecuting them. Here (in Germany), as well as in other highly civilized countries, the principle of anonymity has been entirely abrogated; foundlings, *i. e.*, children who are found entirely helpless, and whose parentage is really unknown, are comparatively very rare. Whenever a child is received into a charitable institution its personal relations are fully established. It is attempted, wherever possible, to leave the child in its natural surroundings—to return it to its parents, or to its mother. Only when domestic relations and domestic environment prove such as would expose the child to

too great danger, the child is cared for by public charity, which, in the matter of care for helpless children, is now usually exercised by placing them in good healthy homes (*Familienpflege*). As a rule a child is first placed in an institution which serves the purpose of a temporary home. Here the children are carefully observed, and every effort made, particularly in case of the older ones, to determine whether they are better adapted for care in an orphanage or in a private family (*Anstalts- oder Familienpflege*). The orphan board (*Waisenverwaltung*) has connections with a large number of respectable families, mostly in the country; to these the children are entrusted, certain fixed rates being paid for their keeping. When so placed a child is under the guardianship of an inspector, usually a local clergyman or teacher, who may, in case of necessity, return it to the orphanage. Here, as elsewhere, experience has taught that cases of total depravity are rare. Most of these children improve immediately when placed in new and healthy surroundings. Thus nearly all of the orphanage work has taken the form of family care (*Familienpflege*), which has given by far the most satisfactory results in the matter of development of character. The sick, the frail, and the feeble-minded, are placed in separate institutions, which afford such care and instruction as the nature of the malady may permit or demand. Institutions for the care and keeping of children while the mother is away at work are not maintained by the public relief. This department is left entirely to private charities, which are sometimes assisted by public appropriations.

V.

The relation of public relief to private charities has, so far as I can see, been even less carefully defined in Germany than in America. On this point also I am in perfect accord with Warner, who has correctly apprehended their respective provinces. Here again the difference lies not in the general principles recognized in the two countries, but in historic development and actual, existing conditions. The very thing which, in Germany,

renders the participation of the citizen in the public relief so valuable is, on the other hand, a hindrance to the development of private charities; while the very circumstances which have impeded the growth of public relief in America have quickened private charities in a most unusual degree. The activity of the German citizen in relief work is a voluntary contribution toward the burdens of the commune; the American makes his contribution in the form of direct private charity. While the German demands that the portion of the public funds to be devoted to poor relief be turned over to him, and expended by him as he shall judge best, the well-to-do American provides himself with a somewhat larger income, and also expends it according to his own judgment. The only difference is, that in Germany the burdens of the public relief are borne by all taxpayers equally, while in America the beneficent and philanthropic man bears a greater share than the egotist, and the latter is relieved at the expense of the former. And yet I do not hesitate to say that the American custom in this matter is worthy of imitation. The very fact that the public funds are at the disposal of the visitor and helper, without restrictions, goes far toward discouraging private charity. and makes a limitation rather than an extension of public relief seem desirable in Germany. In this connection it should be borne in mind that, as already pointed out above, the work of the public relief does not differ in the least from that of private charities, so far as the nature of the work is concerned; the dollar of the one looks exactly like the dollar of the other. The difference lies not in the gift, but in the motive of the giver and in the attendant circumstances. For the commune, poor relief is a legal duty, the exercise of which readily leads the pauper to think he has a right to claim assistance, although the law expressly denies any such right. The recipient of a charity feels no debt of gratitude for the help he receives (except as he may be grateful for the manner in which the aid is given) and that because the gift comes from the public fund. Moreover, the visitor is likely to be more lavish in the expenditure of public moneys than he would be with his own, or with those

entrusted to him by a limited number of friends. For this reason assistance is more easily obtained, as a rule, from a public than from a private charity; very often self-help is not urged as strongly as it should be, and if the officers of public relief are not possessed of a very strong sense of responsibility, or if the district management is not very cautious and conservative, too great liberality may be the direct means of producing and multiplying poverty. The experience of every country and every age might be quoted to verify these statements. We can now understand why it is that even in Germany, where the system of public poor-relief has proved very successful, there is a growing sentiment in favor of restricting public relief, in the main, to such institutions as the workhouse, all else being left to private charity. At present this is, in my opinion, entirely impracticable. So long as we do not insure widows and orphans against the loss of husband and father, upon whom they depend for support, we cannot think of abandoning them to the chance of private charity. Then, too, the public care for the sick and infirm should not only be maintained, but extended by every possible means. These things offer very little opportunity for fraud or abuse, for their external characteristics are far more easily recognized than a mere want of the means of subsistence. Moreover the misuse of accommodations and arrangements for the sick is not so likely to work harm as is fraud in the disposition of public moneys.

One thing must still be demanded on both sides of the Atlantic: the respective provinces of public poor relief and of private charities must be defined as clearly and as carefully as possible; furthermore there must be established between the two a definite and well-ordered relation. This is recognized, in Germany, as the aim and the goal of relief work. To begin at the two extremes one might say: Essentials, necessaries of life, are to be supplied by public charity, while the furnishing of useful or unnecessary things, or even luxuries, shall remain the province of private charities. How much shall be included in the "essentials" must, of course, depend upon circumstances; in

regard to the necessity of animal food or of wearing shoes, for instance, a small rural community will entertain opinions differing widely from those held by the inhabitants of a large city, where barefoot children are not allowed in school and consequently the wearing of shoes becomes a necessity. The establishing and maintaining of institutions for the feeble-minded, the infirm, the deaf and dumb, the blind, and orphans will also fall unquestionably within the province of public charity, although even in Germany the care for the blind and the deaf and dumb has been left largely to private philanthropy, while private institutions very often relieve the state of the burden of caring for orphans. At this point we find the connecting link (between public and private charities) the public subsidies, which have been developed to a considerable extent in Germany also, though not so much as in America. Private institutions for the deaf and dumb and the blind usually receive from the bureau of public charities certain appropriations which go far towards supporting the institutions. Asylums for the aged, the feeble-minded, and children also receive subsidies in the form of free use of public lands, etc. The demands of Warner—careful supervision of all subsidized institutions, regulations in regard to admission and dismissal of such people as are kept in any institution at public expense, and finally specific payment for specific work—are very judicious and proper.

To decide further than this what particular work shall be done by public relief and what left to private charities, will always remain a very difficult matter. In most cases it will be a question of actual conditions: the one branch will have taken charge, to a greater or less degree, of this or that department, from which the other branch will then keep more or less aloof. In any case the commune should be thoroughly familiar with such institutions as already exist, and should carry on the extension of its own efforts accordingly. It is also very desirable that the two branches arrive at some mutual understanding and agreement as to who shall be entitled to aid, under what conditions, etc. The constant annoyance occasioned by shameless

imposters, who now manage to secure duplicate or excessive allowances, could be avoided by keeping a careful registration of all those who receive aid and throwing the register open for the free use of all interested. In Hamburg such a bureau of information was established over a year ago, where at least the names of all those who receive public aid or are supported in charitable institutions are recorded. Attempts to secure the coöperation of the various charitable organizations as well as of individual philanthropists in this matter have met with little encouragement. Similar experiments have been tried in other cities; but their success is very doubtful, for private charity organizations are very loath to reveal the names of their beneficiaries, and besides unsystematic and planless almsgiving is as yet too prevalent. It is clear that in the work of establishing proper relations between public and private charity, the education of the benev olent public will be one of the most important factors. What Warner says in regard to public poor-relief in America —"It is time for us to stop bragging and humbly to take up the study of the science and art of administration"—may be applied equally as well to the majority of the institutions of private charity in Germany. It is really time that the study of the science of poor-relief be taken up by philanthropists in this country (Germany). It is a plain fact that a sort of strange sentimentality is exceedingly predominant; a certain softness of heart which impels those whom it possesses to do something for their unfortunate and suffering fellow-men, without, however, trying to ascertain what is really needful to be done. Above all else it is essential that we break completely with the notion that poor-relief and philanthropy are in themselves meritorious. We must teach, and thoroughly convince everyone of the fact, that the first thing necessary is to find out the causes of poverty —that those measures which aim to set the poor and needy dependent on his feet again and to make him independent are of far greater value than all the beneficence in the world, however good its intentions. House owners who make regular contributions to charitable societies must understand clearly that they

will be doing a great deal more for suffering humanity if they cease to rent poor and unhealthy dwellings; employers must learn the necessity of protecting their employés against dangerous and injurious occupations by suitable hours of work and such other measures of precaution; and all others must be made to comprehend the seemingly very simple truth that the possession of a healthy body is worth more than the nursing of a sick one in the most magnificent hospital. In other words: poor-relief must become *the social science;* its proper exercise can be understood only by a comparative study of economic and social life. We know that no social effort can or will succeed in making poor-relief and philanthropy superfluous, within such a time as lies open to our present vision. But relief work would no doubt be performed far more thoroughly and more intelligently if those engaged in it know and realize that their work is to be for others, not for themselves. The essence of poor-relief is not the gratification of one's self-esteem by giving alms, but the complete resignation, sacrifice of self in the service of others.

DR. E. MUENSTERBERG.

BERLIN, GERMANY.